pr	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	, 09/936,344	BUWALDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	N. Bhat	1764
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: <u>Pending Allowance</u>
(1) <u>N. Bhat</u> .	(3)	
(2) Ms. Sipos.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 20 December 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		,
Rejection(s) discussed: 102/103		
Claims discussed: 1,3-5,7-9 and 11-17		
Prior art documents discussed: Devries and Lenaerts et al.		
Part II.		•
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	n. The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance o	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview

(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner discussed with applicant's representative, that the addition of the cross-linking agent and amount although limiting the claim, does not impart patentability in light of applicant's own disclosure that the cross-linking agents and amounts are known in the arn and that the the starch is cross-bonded with 0.01% to 0.25%....under conditions known to the artisan. See Page 12 of the specification. This information taken with Lenaerts et al. who teaches corsslinke high amylose starch or a composition comprising a non-cereal starch which is cross liked with adipic anhydride, sodium trimetaphosphate or phophorous oxychloride has been taught. Applicant's representative did point out to the the examiner that Lenaerts et al. does not qualify as prior art. The examiner conceded this point but maintained that applicant's own disclosure teaches that cross-linking with these cross-linking agents in the amounts disclosed is known to the artisan. In order to expedite prosecution, the examiner requested applicant to include the amylopecting:amylose ratio set forth in claim 4 into all of the independent claims which was agreed to by applicant which places the application in condition for allowance. Applicant's representative did send a draft amendment making the changes to the applicant who made the changes by examiner's amendment.